

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

NICHOLAS V. TESTACCIO,	:	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	:	
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 21-CV-160
	:	
DON RAHIM, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Defendants.</i>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 8th day of April, 2021, upon consideration of Plaintiff Nicholas V. Testaccio's *pro se* Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 4) it is **ORDERED** that:

1. Testaccio's Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.<sup>1</sup>
2. The Clerk of Court is directed to **TRANSFER FORTHWITH** the above-captioned case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York for the reasons set forth in this Court's January 20, 2021 Order (ECF No. 3).

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Gerald J. Pappert  
**GERALD J. PAPPERT, J.**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Motion consists of an e-mail to the Clerk's Office stating that a Motion for Reconsideration of the Transfer to the Eastern District of New York is attached, (see ECF No. 4-1), and a copy of the January 20, 2021 Order, (see ECF No. 4). A motion for reconsideration should be granted only where the moving party shows that at least one of the following grounds is present: "(1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence that was not available when the court [made its initial decision]; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice." *United States ex rel. Schumann v. Astrazeneca Pharm. L.P.*, 769 F.3d 837, 848–89 (3d Cir. 2014) (quoting *Max's Seafood Café ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999)). Because it lacks any explanation as to whether any of these grounds is present, the Motion must be denied.